United Nations A/C.1/49/PV.19

General Assembly

Official Records

First Committee

19th Meeting

Monday, 14 November 1994, 10 a.m.

New York

Chairman: Mr. Valencia Rodriguez . . . . . (Ecuador)

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

Agenda items 53 to 66, 68 to 73 and 153 ***(continued)***

Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security items

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform members of the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/49/L.3, Haiti; A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1, Peru; A/C.1/49/L.11, Kuwait; A/C.1/49/L.10, Haiti; A/C.1/49/L.12, Kenya, Mongolia and Indonesia; A/C.1/49/L.13, Kenya, Turkmenistan, Cuba, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Austria and Portugal; A/C.1/49/L.18, Turkmenistan and Haiti; A/C.1/49/L.19, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kuwait, Niger and Jordan; A/C.1/49/L.20, Kenya; A/C.1/49/L.21, Kenya and Armenia; A/C.1/49/L.22, Kenya, Kuwait, Netherlands, Turkmenistan, Cuba and Haiti; A/C.1/40/L.23, Turkmenistan and Haiti; A/C.1/49/L.27, Slovakia; A/C.1/49/L.31, Haiti; A/C.1/49/L.35, Haiti; A/C.1/49/L.40/Rev.1, South Africa, Botswana, El Salvador, Swaziland and Costa Rica; A/C.1/49/L.41, Turkmenistan; A/C.1/49/L.42, Belgium, Kenya, Turkmenistan and Haiti; A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1, France, Germany, Japan, Luxembourg, Poland, Sweden, Turkey, Spain and Australia.

The Chairman: In accordance with the Committee's programme of work and timetable, this morning the Committee will proceed to the next phase of its work, namely, action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items, including "Rationalization of the work and reform of the agenda of the First Committee" — that is items 53 to 66, 68 to 73 and 153.

At this meeting the Committee will proceed to take a decision on those draft resolutions that appear in cluster 2 of the Chairman's suggested programme, "Other Weapons of Mass Destruction", namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.3 and A/C.1/49/L.13. Then the Committee will proceed to take a decision on those draft resolutions that appear in cluster 3, "Conventional Weapons", draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.6, A/C.1/49/L.23, A/C.1/49/L.27 and A/C.1/49/L.40/Rev.1.

I understand that some delegations have requested the postponement of a decision on A/C.1/49/L.27. Time permitting, we will then proceed chronologically today up to cluster 6, thus covering draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.42, A/C.1/49/L.43, A/C.1/49/L.1/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.18, A/C.1/49/L.20/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.21 and A/C.1/49/L.15. I understand also that some delegations have asked for the postponement of a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18.

Before the Committee proceeds to the stage of taking action on these draft resolutions, I would like to inform members of the following procedure, which the Committee will observe at this stage of our work.

As far as action on each cluster is concerned, delegations will first have an opportunity to introduce draft

94-87049 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

resolutions with regard to any particular cluster. I will then give the floor to those delegations wishing to make statements other than in explanation of their positions or votes with regard to the draft resolutions in that particular cluster.

Subsequently, delegations will have an opportunity to explain their positions or votes before a decision is taken on any or all draft resolutions contained in a particular cluster.

After the Committee has taken a decision on the draft resolutions contained in a given cluster, an opportunity will be given to delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes after the decision is taken on any or all draft resolutions contained in a particular cluster. In this regard, I would like to urge delegations to kindly make a consolidated statement on draft resolutions contained in a particular cluster, with respect to the statements and explanations of positions or votes concerned.

In order to avoid any misunderstanding, I would like to urge those members of the Committee who wishing to ask for a recorded vote on any particular resolution to kindly inform the Secretariat of their intention before the Committee begins its action on any individual cluster.

The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 2, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.3. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.3, entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes", is sponsored by Gambia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the African Group of States, and also by Haiti.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

I hear no objection. I take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.3 was adopted.

The Chairman: We now move to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.13. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.13 is entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction". This draft resolution is sponsored by the following delegations: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zimbabwe.

In connection with this draft resolution, I should like to read out the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General:

"By the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.13, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance to the depositary Powers of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction and to provide such services as may be required for the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the Third Review Conference, as well as the decisions contained in the Final Report of the Special Conference, including all necessary assistance to the Ad Hoc Group of Governmental Experts.

"It should be noted that the Third Review Conference and the Special Conference are Conferences of States Parties to the Convention. As was the case in the past, conferences on multilateral disarmament treaties — for example, the seabed Treaty, the biological weapons Convention and the environmental modification Convention — included in their rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the costs of the conference, including the session of the preparatory committee.

"Under those arrangements, no additional cost was borne by the regular budget of the Organization. Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.13 to provide the necessary assistance and required services for the implementation of decisions and recommendations of the Third Review Conference and

the Special Conference has no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that the associated costs will be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the Conference of the Convention.

"Furthermore, all activities related to international conventions or treaties that, under their respective legal instruments, are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may only be undertaken when sufficient resources to cover the activities in question have been received from the States parties in advance."

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.13 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions after the decision.

Mr. Madden (United States of America): The United States supported draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.3 on the prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes, which has just been adopted. We are sympathetic to the main thrust of the draft resolution, which draws attention to, and expresses legitimate concern about, the potential hazards that would evolve from the irresponsible disposal of nuclear wastes. Nevertheless, we feel that the First Committee is not the appropriate forum to deal with this matter.

Mr. Starr (Australia): Australia also supported draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.3 on the prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes. Australia is sympathetic to the main thrust of this draft resolution, which draws attention to, and expresses concern about, the potential hazards underlying any use of nuclear wastes which would constitute radiological warfare and its implications for regional and international security.

We have some concerns, however, about the appropriate venue and organization for the consideration of a legally-binding instrument, as referred to in operative paragraph 8. Any decisions in this respect would need to take into account the various competencies and ongoing work of the Conference on Disarmament, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the International Maritime Organization. At this stage, we are not in a position to judge what recommendations for action might appropriately be directed at which organization. Australia reaffirms, however, its unqualified opposition to the dumping of nuclear wastes by any State or organization that would constitute radiological warfare and have grave implications for the security of all States.

The Chairman: We now move to consider cluster 3, on conventional weapons.

I shall first call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than in explanation of their position on draft resolutions contained in cluster 3.

Mrs. Londoño Jaramillo (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In an effort to speed up the Committee's work, we believe, since there are other draft resolutions with similar objectives, draft decision A/C.1/49/L.6, sponsored by Colombia, should be withdrawn.

Mr. Ekwall (Sweden): I wish to speak in reference to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23, on the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects.

Like last year's draft resolution on this Convention, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23 contains, in its last preambular paragraph, a reference to the draft resolution on assistance in mine clearance. That draft resolution is dealt with directly in the plenary of the General Assembly. Action on it has not yet been taken by the plenary. Therefore, the blank spaces in the last preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23 remain open for the time being. The Secretariat will, however, fill in the appropriate data with respect to number and date as soon as the draft resolution on assistance in mine clearance has been adopted.

Mr. Liukkonen (Finland): The delegation of Finland would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19, concerning the moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines.

As Under-Secretary Blomberg emphasized in his statement to the Committee on 18 October, Finland considers the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel land-mines to be an issue deserving urgent international attention. This draft resolution serves to heighten that attention, and rightly so.

The issue itself is at present being negotiated by the States parties to Protocol II of the 1980 Convention on

Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. As a State party, Finland works actively in those negotiations for a stronger Protocol II. We urge those States remaining outside the Convention to adhere and join us in this important negotiation.

Finland considers it very important that the recommendations made by the General Assembly should not be construed as somehow prejudging the outcome of the ongoing negotiations between the States parties.

It is with this concern in mind that Finland reserves its position on operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19.

Mr. Florent (France) *(interpretation from French)*: My delegation wishes to speak on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19, entitled "Moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines", which was introduced by the delegation of the United States.

France hopes that this draft resolution will be adopted without a vote. It is important that on a basic issue such as this the international community should clearly demonstrate, with solidarity, its determination to combat and prevent this veritable scourge, the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel land-mines.

In December 1993 my delegation co-sponsored the draft that became resolution 48/75 K. Furthermore, as was recalled in the report (A/49/275) of the Secretary-General, France decided unilaterally in 1993 to enforce a moratorium on the export of all types of anti-personnel land-mines, regardless of their destination. We are also very pleased at the decision taken by more than 20 countries to establish a moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines.

Like many other States, France attaches great importance to ending once and for all the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel land-mines, which is why we also took the initiative in February 1993 of calling for the convening of an international Conference to review the 1980 Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, in order to strengthen the provisions of Protocol II on mines and booby traps. That is also why, together with our partners in the European Community, we support every effort by the General Assembly in regard to assistance in demining.

For all these reasons, France would have liked to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19, just as it co-sponsored the draft that became resolution 48/75 K. Unfortunately it could not do so, because of the mention in operative paragraph 6 of the eventual elimination of anti-personnel land-mines. We believe that such a reference, which is already contained in the sixth preambular paragraph — more logically in our view, having regard to its political, declaratory nature — would have a negative effect on negotiations under way in the Group of Governmental Experts charged with reviewing the 1980 Convention and its Protocols — above all, Protocol II on mines and booby traps.

As the work of the Group of Governmental Experts clearly shows, there is at this stage no consensus — far from it — on the very principle of a total ban on anti-personnel land-mines. It would seem to us to be preferable, therefore, to avoid further complicating the work of the Group of Governmental Experts, by initiatives which risk being counter-productive at this stage, making more difficult the work of the Group of Governmental Experts, which should lead to agreement between the States parties during the review conference to be convened in September-October 1995.

Similarly, it does not seem clear to us that the reference in operative paragraph 6 to the eventual elimination of anti-personnel land-mines would facilitate the broadest possible adherence to the Convention and its Protocols, a matter which for our delegation is a priority.

In that respect, France welcomes the wish of the United States to become a party to the Convention and its Protocols.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions contained in cluster 3. I remind delegations that draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.6 has been withdrawn and action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.27 has been postponed.

We shall proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19, entitled "Moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines" was introduced by the representative of the United States of America at the 12th meeting of the Committee on 3 November 1994 and is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas,

Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chad, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mongolia, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu and Yemen.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23, "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects", introduced by the representative of Sweden at the fifteenth meeting, on 9 November 1994, is sponsored by Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkmenistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

In connection with draft resolution L.23, I should like to read the following statement on behalf of the Secretary-General:

"By the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.23, concerning the convening of a review conference on the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, and its preparatory work by a group of governmental experts, the General Assembly takes note of the decisions by the group of governmental experts to hold an additional meeting in Geneva from 9 to 20 January 1995 and to request the Secretary-General to convene the review conference in Geneva within the time frame 25 September to 13 October 1995.

"The Assembly would further request the Secretary-General to continue furnishing needed assistance and to assure services to the group of governmental experts and to the conference to review the Convention. It should be noted that the review conference will be a conference of States Parties to the Convention. As was the case in the past, conferences on multilateral disarmament treaties, for example the Sea-Bed Treaty, the Biological Weapons Convention and the Environmental Modification Convention, included in their rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the costs of the conference, including the sessions of the preparatory committee. Under those arrangements, no additional cost was borne by the regular budget of the Organization.

"Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23 to provide the necessary assistance and services for the preparation and holding of the review conference has no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that the associated costs would be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the review conference of the Convention.

"Furthermore, all activities related to international conventions or treaties that under their respective legal instruments are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may only be undertaken when sufficient resources to cover the activities in question have been received from the States Parties in advance."

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the First Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23 was adopted.

The Chairman: We will now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.40/Rev.1. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.40/Rev.1, "Measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms", was introduced in its revised form by the representative of Afghanistan at the 15th meeting on 9 November 1994. The draft resolution is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Botswana, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland and Zimbabwe.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.40/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions.

Mr. Rivero Rosario (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23, on the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed To Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects. The 1980 Convention has been reaffirmed today as the cornerstone of the entire process of adopting the necessary legal framework for regulating the use of land-mines and other instruments. Cuba was one of the first countries to ratify the Convention.

Over the years the indiscriminate use of such weapons and the consequences of unregulated exports have confirmed the Convention's relevance and the need to strengthen it in spirit, letter and scope by holding a review conference. The most noble humanitarian calls made by many countries and humanitarian organizations, both governmental and non-governmental, have been heard in the debates of the group of governmental experts preparing for the review conference. However, the group's work will continue to be effective to the extent that the delicate balance of positions and interests in this area is maintained.

Humanitarian arguments should not be used to shield maximalist, selective or discriminatory positions. A future regime banning the use of land-mines will be achievable only if its tenets are compatible with the principles of sovereignty and the right of States to self-defence.

The illusion about the technological reliability of some sophisticated mines produced by certain developed countries is as bad and inhuman as the consequences of the indiscriminate use of conventional mines, which provide defences for developing countries lacking, for economic reasons, access to arsenals of technically advanced weapons. Confidence-building measures should not replace intrusive verification measures, measures incompatible with the principle of sovereignty, and unjustifiable from the technical point of view. The main purpose of the review of the 1980 Convention should be to ensure the maximum universality for that legal instrument, since the minimal number of States parties, which do not include the principal producers, guarantees neither its effectiveness nor its observance by the majority of the international community.

My country will continue to contribute to the negotiating process begun in draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23, while it reconciles the objectives outlined earlier, objectives inherent in the positions of principle of many developing countries.

Mr. Starr (Australia): I wish to explain Australia's position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19, "Moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines". Australia, once again, supports the draft resolution. It commends the humanitarian concerns of United States Senator Patrick Leahy, which led to this initiative for moratoriums on exports of anti-personnel mines. Australia, however, is one of many countries, some of them sponsors of the draft resolution, that believe that anti-personnel mines can be a legitimate conventional weapon. We can share the objective of replacing them with more humane and viable alternatives, if such can be found, in future.

In the meantime, it is critical that current stocks of anti-personnel mines be replaced with self-destructing and self-deactivating mines. Unless countries such as Australia, which do not currently produce anti-personnel mines, are to become producers, achieving this objective must involve the export of mines. In Australia's view, only self-destructing anti-personnel mines should be exported, and only to States parties to Protocol II of the 1980 Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects.

Those are the proposals that we, together with a number of colleagues, have made in the group of experts

preparing for the 1995 review conference of that Convention. We believe, therefore, that this draft resolution is at odds with achievable short-term means of protecting civilians. In this regard, we appeal to delegations to ask their capitals to demonstrate greater commitment to the spirit of this draft resolution by supporting, in the Geneva group of experts, proposals for a phased-in ban on the use of non-self-destructing anti-personnel mines and on their production and trade, as well as a permanent ban on the export of anti-personnel mines to States not parties to Protocol II.

Mr. Sinirlioğlu (Turkey): I would like to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.19 and L.23.

We fully share the view that the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel land-mines causes great humanitarian and economic problems. We strongly support the goal of ending the human tragedy they cause. Therefore, we attach great importance to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19, which we have adopted by consensus. However, we are not in full agreement with the wording of paragraph 6. We understand the definition of "eventual elimination" in that paragraph as a political goal which we must strive to attain in the future. With that understanding in mind, we joined in the consensus. Had paragraph 6 been put to a separate vote, we would have abstained in that vote.

On the other hand, the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects constitutes one of the cornerstone instruments in the field of disarmament. Turkey is a signatory of that Convention. We are following very closely the preparatory process for the review conference of the Convention, which will be convened next year. In that context, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23, which has been adopted by consensus, is particularly important. But we are not in full agreement with the wording of certain paragraphs. However, in the spirit of compromise, we joined in the consensus.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19. In that connection, we reaffirm our position on the moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines, which we stated at last year's session when a draft resolution on this item was adopted, destined to become General Assembly resolution 48/75. That statement is summarized in document A/C.1/48/SR.28 of 7 January 1994.

Mr. Kamal (Pakistan): I wish to explain the position of Pakistan on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19, entitled "Moratorium on the export of anti-personnel mines". Pakistan joined the consensus on this draft resolution because we share the basic concern that motivated the sponsors to submit the draft resolution. Like them, we are convinced that urgent, concrete measures need to be taken to protect civilians from the effects of the indiscriminate use of land-mines. Pakistan's concern about the effects of land-mines is based on our direct experience with the havoc caused by these weapons. During the Afghan conflict, millions of mines were sowed indiscriminately in all parts of Afghanistan. Over 10 million mines still lie uncleared in that country. Thousands of civilians have been maimed and continue to be injured by those mines. Vast areas of that country have been rendered uninhabitable. More than a million Afghan refugees remain stranded in Pakistan, unable to return to their homeland because of the threat posed by the mines.

While we share the view that specific steps need to be taken to eliminate the threat posed by land-mines, we believe that careful consideration is required on how to achieve that objective. It is necessary to realize that it is not the use of land-mines *per se* that causes problems; rather, it is the indiscriminate use of land-mines that creates havoc. Land-mines are essentially defensive weapons. Properly used, they are an effective means of deterring attacks, and thus have a definite place in the defensive arsenals of States.

However, if they are laid indiscriminately, land-mines assume a different and thoroughly malignant character. The focus, therefore, should be on stopping the indiscriminate use of land-mines. A number of measures could be taken to that end. For instance, it must be ensured that all parties carry out proper mapping of the mines they lay. Mines that are used should be detectable or even self-destructing or self-neutralizing after a period of time. Finally, there should be a legal regime that would treat the indiscriminate use of land-mines as a war crime. The parties that lay these land-mines should be held responsible for their removal once hostilities cease.

Those measures, along with others, are being considered by the group of experts preparing for the review conference of the Convention on inhumane weapons. In our view, the best forum for deciding on specific measures relating to land-mine use would be that review conference. Measures suggested in draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19 could be among those considered by the conference. We look forward to the convening of the conference in

September next year, and are hopeful that its deliberations will result in providing civilians with effective protection against the indiscriminate use of land-mines.

Mr. Jaguaribe (Brazil): I should like to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19.

My delegation attaches great importance to this draft resolution and fully shares its main thrust and objective, as made evident by the position we have adopted today. Brazil considers that the indiscriminate and irresponsible proliferation of anti-personnel land-mines has to be stopped.

We have not exported these weapons for over three years. We would have liked to be able to become one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, but, unfortunately, the maintenance of the present drafting of operative paragraph 6 did not allow for that. We believe that land-mines can be a legitimate defensive weapon, and they are not yet replaceable. We believe, therefore, that the last part of operative paragraph 6 is a premature and inaccurate political statement.

Mr. Leshem-Stein (Israel): I wish to explain the position of Israel on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19.

Israel joined the consensus because it believes that the international community should seriously address the problem of land-mines, which cause so many tragedies for the civilian population. On 15 July this year, Israel adopted a two-year moratorium on the export of anti-personnel mines. During this period, Israel will be working with other interested parties to review the establishment of the permanent regime for banning the transfer of anti-personnel mines. In addition to the two-year moratorium, Israel offers its know-how, assistance and training in de-mining.

Israel hopes that these steps, which are humanitarian in nature, will also serve as a global confidence-building measure and will encourage other countries, especially from our region, to follow suit.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation would like to make a few comments on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.40/Rev.1, "Measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional weapons", as well on A/C.1/49/L.19, "Moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines".

My delegation sympathizes with the basic thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.40/Rev.1. However, we found some of its elements inconsistent with its title. In other words, this draft resolution has gone beyond addressing the illicit transfer and use of conventional weapons, in particular in the fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs.

In that light, acceptance of this draft resolution by my delegation should not be construed as approval of those elements that are outside the scope of the draft.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19, "Moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines", we share some of the concerns expressed by previous speakers with respect to the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 6. We also think that the international situation is ripe to address the irresponsible and indiscriminate use of anti-personnel land-mines, and we join the consensus on this draft. Again, our acceptance of the consensus should not be construed as full acceptance of the sixth preambular paragraph and of operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.19.

Mrs. Castro de Barish (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.23, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate effects". We did not have an opportunity to make that known at the appropriate time, but we would like to express our firm support for it and to thank the other sponsors for their valuable initiative.

The Chairman: We will now proceed to cluster 4: regional disarmament and security.

I shall first call on those delegations wishing to make statements on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 4.

Ms. Hasan (Pakistan): I have the honour to introduce, on behalf of its co-sponsors, the draft resolution entitled "Regional disarmament", contained in document A/C.1/49/L.42.

At the present time, the major threats to international peace and security emanate from disputes and arms buildups at the regional levels. Many of the factors that drive regional arms races are specific to each region or subregion. To expect the realization of the goal of regional disarmament through the adoption of global approaches alone is unrealistic. Global measures that lead to a more benign international environment have a positive effect on containing regional arms buildups. These measures are

therefore necessary, but by themselves are not sufficient for promoting regional disarmament.

This fact was recognized by the Tenth Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in Jakarta in 1992, which commended the regional approach in the following words:

> "The Heads of State or Government recognized that security problems which are region-specific and are best addressed within an appropriate regional context. Global and regional approaches to disarmament complement each other and should be pursued simultaneously to promote regional and international peace and security." *(A/47/675, annex, chap. II, para. 42)*

That position was reaffirmed by the Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Movement who met recently in Cairo.

We remain convinced that efforts to achieve regional disarmament must be pursued in tandem with global approaches to disarmament. Initiatives to promote regional disarmament cannot be put on hold on the specious pretext that only global approaches can ensure meaningful disarmament. The peoples of regions that are burdened with increasing armaments cannot be told that they can have no relief until the distant Utopia of global disarmament is achieved.

It is with the objective of encouraging regional approaches to disarmament that the co-sponsors put forward the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.42. We hope that the draft resolution will again be given the overwhelming support it has traditionally enjoyed in the First Committee.

I also have the honour of introducing, on behalf of Haiti, Swaziland and Pakistan, the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/49/L.43, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels".

The draft resolution addresses the issue of the threat to international peace and security posed by conventional arms buildups in various regions of the world. Arms buildups in regions of tension aggravate existing conditions and increase the chances of outright conflict. It is therefore necessary that measures be taken to control conventional arms buildups at the regional and subregional levels.

Until now the major effort has been directed not at controlling conventional arms, but towards instituting confidence-building measures, particularly in the area of expenditures and transfers of conventional arms. While these measures can be useful, they must be complemented by steps to actually control conventional arms at the regional and subregional levels.

Substantive and meaningful conventional arms control measures have not been undertaken in regions other than Europe. To institute such measures it would be helpful if the regional parties concerned had before them basic principles that would serve as a framework for negotiations on this issue. Last year the sponsors introduced a similar draft resolution in order to initiate the process of evolving in the Conference on Disarmament, widely accepted principles on the basis of which conventional arms control talks could be held.

During the past year the Conference on Disarmament was preoccupied with various other major issues. We have used this period to hold informal discussions with several interested parties on this matter. On the basis of these discussions a paper on the possible principles that can serve as a framework for negotiations on conventional arms control will be circulated in the next session of the Conference on Disarmament. The views of Member States on the contents of the paper and the ensuing discussions would, hopefully, lead to the formulation of a set of principles that can serve as a guide for parties seeking to control conventional arms at the regional and subregional levels.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.43 is substantively the same as resolution 48/75 J, which enjoyed the broad support of the Committee last year. We hope that this year, again, the Committee will extend the widest support to this draft.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. Chandra (India): The Indian delegation wishes to explain its vote on the draft resolutions contained in document A/C.1/49/L.43 and L.42.

Draft resolution L.43 is seriously flawed, as it does not take into account the ideas enshrined in the guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security which was developed after detailed and extensive debate last year by the Disarmament Commission and which, *inter alia*, stipulated:

First, regional arrangements for disarmaments and arms limitation should be agreed freely between all participating States on the basis of the principle of sovereign equality of all the States concerned and should take into account the specific conditions and characteristics of the region.

Secondly, States participating in regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should define the region to which the arrangements between them apply.

Thirdly, regional arrangements should take into account the need to address broader non-military factors which affect security.

Fourthly, regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should address, in all its aspects, the question of the accumulation of conventional weapons beyond the legitimate self-defence requirements of States.

Not only do these ideas find no specific mention in the draft resolution, but, indeed, the latter conceptually runs counter to them by failing to approach the issue holistically in a broader political — military framework and by seeking to address it on a narrow one-dimensional plane, on which it cannot succeed.

In contending, moreover, that States with larger military capabilities or militarily significant States have a special responsibility in promoting such agreements, it ignores the fact that such States often have wider security problems and concerns, and that each State must contribute equally to regional security to the maximum extent of its means.

My delegation also cannot accept the primacy of place in the disarmament agenda which the draft resolution appears to give to conventional arms control. We believe that nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction cause the most serious threat to international peace and security, and our endeavours should therefore largely be focused on efforts to contain this threat.

The call in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution to the Conference on Disarmament to formulate principles to be applied to regional arms control negotiations is therefore unfortunate, particularly at a time when it is fully stretched in comprehensive test-ban treaty negotiations and, possibly, negotiations which could begin on cut-off in production of fissile material for weapons purposes or other nuclear explosive devices.

Above all, given the fact that regional arrangements are region-specific, the Conference on Disarmament exercise on this issue would be futile and a repetition of the excellent work already done in this regard by the Disarmament Commission.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.42, while making a reference to the 1993 Disarmament Commission consensus report on regional approaches to disarmament, largely ignores its guidelines and recommendations on the subject. For instance, while the Disarmament Commission guidelines recognize that regional arrangements for disarmament and arms limitation should contribute to regional security at the lowest possible level of armaments, and on the basis of undiminished security for all participating States, the draft resolution focuses on the security of smaller States and contends that the enhancement thereof would reduce the risk of regional conflicts.

We feel that it is more realistic to recognize, as did the Disarmament Commission, that the security concerns of all States — large and small — must be equally met in order to reduce the risk of regional conflicts. The draft resolution furthermore seeks to address nuclear non-proliferation, not only at the regional level, but also on a subregional basis. The Disarmament Commission in its wisdom, did not go that far in contemplating dealing with nuclear non-proliferation on a subregional basis.

As we indicated earlier, and as is well-known, we are of the view that nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects is a global issue, which can only be dealt with effectively globally.

It is against this backdrop that we are constrained to abstain on both these draft resolutions and to call for a recorded vote.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.42.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.42 entitled "Regional disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 19th meeting of the Committee on 14 November 1994, and is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Armenia, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa

Rica, Czech Republic, Egypt, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Italy, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Republic of Moldova, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United States of America, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Turkmenistan.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

India, Nigeria

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.42 was adopted by 140 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Paraguay advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.43.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.43, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 19th meeting today, 14 November 1994, and is sponsored by the following countries: Haiti, Pakistan and Swaziland.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname,

Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, India, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Singapore

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.43 was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Paraguay advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Rivero Rosario (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to briefly explain its position on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/49/L.42 and A/C.1/49/L.43.

Last year the Cuban delegation went along with the consensus on the text adopted, which later became resolution 48/75 G, entitled "Regional disarmament". It was closely linked to guidelines and recommendations on the regional approach to disarmament that had been negotiated seriously and at length within the framework of the Disarmament Commission. In our delegation's view, that text reflected quite adequately the interests of all delegations in the field of regional disarmament.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.42 deals with the same issues of regional disarmament. However, in my delegation's view, it lacks certain ideas that we feel are of special importance, such as the question of the initiative and participation of all States of a given region in negotiating and adopting regional disarmament measures. None the less, we voted in favour of the draft resolution, because we believe it contains some useful elements.

In our opinion, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.43 singles out for disproportionate treatment some specific aspects of the issue of regional approaches to disarmament. In some passages there are ideas that our delegation cannot support, since they differ from what was negotiated in the Disarmament Commission. In the preambular part, as in draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.42, the question of the initiative and participation of all the countries of the region has been left out. Also forgotten is the key consideration of the legitimate self-defence needs of States.

In addition, in establishing that conventional arms control should be carried out primarily at the regional and subregional levels, there is no mention of the need for global control of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction or of the influence of and relationship with the global process of controlling conventional weapons.

Finally, with regard to the operative part, we feel that the Conference on Disarmament has before it important negotiations, such as the discussion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The negotiating body should not take on tasks that distract it from its highest priorities.

For those reasons, our delegation was compelled to abstain in the voting on that draft resolution.

The Chairman: We shall now turn to cluster 5, "Confidence-building measures, including transparency in armaments".

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions on draft resolutions contained in cluster 5 before the voting.

Mr. Arnhold (Germany): As one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21, entitled "Implementation of the guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures", I would like to ask you, Sir, to postpone action on that draft resolution, as consultations are still going on.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation emphasizes its full support for the international trend to build an international community that does not use force or the threat of the use of force, and in which the principles of justice, equality and peace prevail. We reiterate our readiness and willingness to participate in any international effort seeking in good faith to achieve this objective.

We should like to point out that draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.18, entitled "Transparency in armaments", does not take into account the special situation in the Middle East, where the Arab-Israeli conflict continues,

because Israel is still occupying Arab territories and has refused to implement relevant Security Council resolutions. Moreover, Israel possesses the most dangerous weapons of mass destruction and is capable of producing and stockpiling all kinds of sophisticated weapons. Thus, transparency with regard to Israeli armaments can be established, in respect of the tip of the iceberg.

The Chairman: I remind the Committee that we are considering the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/49/L.1/Rev.1 and A/C.1/49/L.20/Rev.1. Action on draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.18 and A/C.1/49/L.21 has been postponed.

Mr. Rivero Rosario (Cuba) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: My delegation supports draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.20/Rev.1. However, as we should like to make some additional comments on it, we request that action on it be postponed.

Mr. Jaguaribe (Brazil): I support the request that has just been made by the representative of Cuba.

The Chairman: In that case, action on draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.18, A/C.1/49/L.20/Rev.1 and A/C.1/49/L.21 is postponed.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.1/Rev.1. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.1/Rev.1, which is entitled "Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures", was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 12th meeting of the Committee, on 3 November 1994. It is sponsored by the following countries: Austria, Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and United States of America.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.1/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position.

Mr. Karem (Egypt): I should like to explain my delegation's position in respect of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.1/Rev.1. Had the draft resolution been put to the vote my delegation would have abstained. Egypt continues to believe that transparency of military expenditures and the reporting mechanisms associated with this effort remain ineffective as a disarmament measure. We are rather disappointed that the issues of objective information on military matters and transparency of military expenditures have been merged at this session. Such a link will only detract from the value of the guidelines adopted by the Disarmament Commission on objective information, and we hope that this situation will be remedied in the future.

Mr. Kamal (Pakistan): I would like to explain briefly the position of the delegation of Pakistan on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.1/Rev.1, on transparency of military expenditures. Pakistan continues to support the ultimate objective of the draft resolution. Greater transparency in regard to military expenditures would contribute to removing suspicions between States. The lessening of suspicions would also contribute to an eventual decrease in the military expenditures of States. Up to this point we agree with the logic of the draft resolution and therefore joined the consensus on it.

Our reservations pertain to two aspects of the draft resolution. First, it tends to give the impression that greater transparency is a panacea for lessening tensions and promoting peace. Transparency cannot by itself lead to a reduction of military expenditures. It needs to be realized and explicitly stated that transparency is just one of the conditions that can contribute to decreased military spending. The essential prerequisite for achieving this objective is to remove the basic causes of disputes between States. Without movement on that track, measures to promote transparency will merely assume a cosmetic character and will not result in any significant decrease in military expenditures.

Our second reservation relates to the specific methodology by which military expenditures are to be reduced. Reductions in military budgets by specified percentages, which have frequently been advocated by some States, might create a power equation that is more disadvantageous to some countries than to others. It would not eliminate existing disparities. To maintain an equilibrium, it would be equitable to link the reduction of

expenditures with force reductions, expressed in physical terms, and to provide for the number of men and machines to be reduced. This seems to be the approach followed by the mutual force reduction talks held in Vienna, and the talks on conventional forces in Europe. A similar approach was also outlined in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly, the first devoted to disarmament, and there is a need to initiate ways and means to implement that decision.

The success of efforts to bring about meaningful reductions will depend ultimately on the extent to which existing tensions are reduced and security in different regions is enhanced. Peaceful co-existence has yet to emerge as a universal phenomenon. Primary attention should be paid to achieving this.

The Chairman: We will now move to cluster 6, "Outer space disarmament aspects".

I call on delegations wishing to explain their vote before the voting.

Mr. Madden (United States of America): My delegation wishes to explain how it will vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.15, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". We will abstain for several reasons. The most important deficiency is the language in operative paragraph 8, which requests the Conference on Disarmament to prepare for negotiations to conclude an agreement to prevent an arms race in outer space. This request is one to which the United States cannot subscribe.

In truth, there is no arms race in outer space today. The absence of the alleged arms race in outer space can be attributed to the legal agreements on space already in existence. Those same agreements also serve to prevent a future arms race. Thus, the negotiation of any future agreements is not required.

This draft resolution also fails to take into account the reality that there have been historic changes in the global security environment, particularly in relations between the United States and Russia. Because of these changes, and since there is no arms race in outer space, as alleged, there is no foundation for the claim contained in the seventh preambular paragraph that the so-called arms race in outer space represents a

"grave danger for international peace and security".

In addition, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.15 contains many other elements that simply run counter to the views and policies of the United States. While we have no objection to reviewing issues related to outer space arms control, we do not agree with the fourteenth preambular paragraph or with operative paragraph 8 regarding negotiations on measures to prevent an arms race in outer space. Nor do we agree with the eighteenth preambular paragraph that the fundamental task of the Conference on Disarmament is to negotiate such an agreement.

Finally, my delegation is disappointed that the current text of operative paragraph 10 continues to contain outmoded language which we had previously identified as inaccurate. This paragraph should be deleted. It no longer corresponds to reality.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian delegation fully supports the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/49/L.15 on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

We share the view that the Conference on Disarmament has a leading role to play in multilateral efforts to prevent an arms race in outer space. In our view, the most promising sphere for the activities of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament is the preparation of a comprehensive set of confidence-building measures and the guarantee of transparency and predictability for States in their activities in outer space. In that field, the Ad Hoc Committee has a great deal of work to do, which has been initiated by various countries.

However, I should state that the draft resolution as submitted at this session does not fully reflect the realities of the world today. We do not consider it is timely to make an urgent appeal to the Russian Federation and the United States of America to resume the bilateral talks on the prevention of an arms race in outer space which were held between the former Soviet Union and the United States within the context of the preparation of START I. This appeal is contained in operative paragraph 10, on which the delegation of Russia will abstain in a separate vote.

The Chairman: I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.15, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 15th meeting of the Committee on 9 November 1994. It is sponsored by the

following countries: Algeria, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Sri Lanka, Ukraine, Venezuela, Ethiopia, Kazakhstan, Myanmar and Viet Nam.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.15. A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the eighteenth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The eighteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 98 votes to 1, with 41 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Paraguay advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 8.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Paragraph 8 was retained by 97 votes to 1, with 40 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Paraguay advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 10.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Omar, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Paragraph 10 was retained by 87 votes to 1, with 51 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Paraguay advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.15 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Marshall Islands, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.15 was adopted by 140 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Paraguay advised the secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): As I pointed out at the beginning of this meeting, we have made progress in considering clusters 2 to 6. In this regard, the Committee's work has been very effective. Therefore, and as many delegations wish to consult on several draft resolutions, I intend to cancel this afternoon's meeting in order to allow them to carry out the necessary consultations.

Tomorrow morning, if the Committee agrees, we will consider cluster 7 in chronological order, including the draft resolutions whose consideration was left pending this morning.

Ms. Duncan (New Zealand): With regard to your announcement, Sir, the supporters of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.7, regarding the expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament, will be submitting to the Secretariat some revisions to the text. There will be a revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.7 available tomorrow morning, and it may be necessary to defer consideration of this issue in order to allow delegations enough time to consider the revisions.

The Chairman: The Committee will take note of that statement in relation to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.7.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.